IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

2.00.2065 IEA DM

Ronald Brunson,)	C/A No. 3:08-2965-JFA-BM
Plaintiff,)	
VS.)	ORDER
Federal Bureau of Investigation; Steve)	
Patterson; WWDM; NAACP; Nelson River III;)	
Central Intelligence Agency; Law Enforcement)	
Center; SLED Chief; Sumter Housing)	
Authority; Jones Buick Pontiac; Tuomey)	
Health Care System; Governor Mark Sanford;)	
U.S. Justice Department; and U.S. Postal)	
Service,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
	_)	

The pro se plaintiff, Ronald Brunson, initiated this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the defendants. He asserts a variety of claims against various state, federal, and private individuals. Central to the plaintiff's claims in this case is his allegation that the defendants conspired together to place some type of monitoring system in his "internals" that feeds information about the plaintiff to the defendant CIA and others.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action1 has prepared a Report and Recommendation ("Report") dated September 8, 2008 wherein he suggests that this court

The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule

^{73.02.} The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

3:08-cv-02965-JFA Date Filed 10/06/08 Entry Number 14 Page 2 of 2

should summarily dismiss the plaintiff's action. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant

facts and standards of law on these matters, and the court incorporates such without a full

recitation.

The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report. He filed timely

objections to the Report on September 10, 2008 in the form of a letter.

In his objection memorandum, plaintiff clarifies his contention that these monitoring

devices were placed in his ears "at birth." Beyond that, the objection memorandum is

essentially unintelligible and merely serves to reconfirm the Magistrate Judge's initial

conclusion that the assertions in the complaint "cannot be given even momentary credibility."

Moreover, the Magistrate Judge points out that the plaintiff has failed to exhaust his

administrative remedies with regard to his request for FBI records; he has not filed the pre-

suit notice required to bring an action under the Federal Tort Claims Act; several of the

defendants enjoy various types of immunity; and several of the private individuals are not

subject to a claim under 42 U.S.C.§ 1983.

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, the Report, and the objections

thereto, the court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation to be proper. Accordingly,

the Report is incorporated herein by reference and the case is dismissed without prejudice

and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

October 6, 2008

Columbia, South Carolina

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.

Joseph F. anderson, J.

United States District Judge

2